

bill. I call the attention of my friend from Kansas, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to the fact that I understand there is in Washington at this time a large group of gentlemen representing the soybean group of the Middle West. They have seen some very important Republicans and that they are about to issue a statement on the bill, not the one introduced by me but a bill introduced by somebody who copied my bill 6 years after I introduced my first one. However, I am glad to have you join up with me even though you introduced your bill long after I introduced mine. We are all walking along the same street, and I am glad to have you with me. I understand the announcement will be made next week. Join up with us and let us take off this unconstitutional, unreasonable, and unpalatable tax of 15 cents on oleomargarine. You do not get Bang's disease from oleomargarine, you do not get tuberculosis from oleomargarine, all you get is a 15-cent tax. Oleomargarine has more vitamins and it has more calories than butter, and it is much more available. So join up early.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include therein an article on some problems of the United States Merchant Marine by Mr. Frazer Bailey, president of the National Federation of American Shipping.

Mr. MANASCO asked and was given permission to extend the remarks he intends to make in Committee of the Whole today and include some letters.

Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include two editorials from the News and Observer, Raleigh, N. C., edited by Hon. Josephus Daniels, Secretary of the Navy during the First World War, the subject being world government.

Mr. SOMERS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. FULTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in two instances and to include an address by Hon. John Hildring, of the National United Jewish Appeal Conference, Atlantic City, N. J., December 13, 1947, and an address by Gen. Joseph T. McNarney at the same conference.

Mr. COUDERT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record in three separate instances and to include some newspaper material.

Mr. MCGARVEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement by John Frey, president of the metal trades department of the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. HOPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include copies of a resolution adopted at the recent annual meeting of the National Association of Farmers.

Mr. FOGARTY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement by Richard Grey, president of the building and construction trades department of the American Federation of Labor, before the

Joint Committee on Housing of the Congress of the United States yesterday morning.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FOGARTY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a statement of the union's position on the GSI strike.

#### THE PALESTINE SITUATION—THREAT OF ANOTHER WORLD WAR

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] in what he said about this international Sanhedrin up here in New York, shown as the United Nations, attempting to subordinate the United States to its domination.

I also want to remind you that the mothers and fathers and the servicemen of this Nation who just fought two wars in the last 30 years do not want that outfit dragging us into a race war in Palestine.

I am speaking now for the real Americans.

They have no right to drag us into a race war in Palestine. They have no more right to go in there and set up a racial state in Palestine than they have to set up an Indian state in Ohio or Pennsylvania or to set up a Negro state in Virginia, Texas, or Mississippi.

It is about time that the American people were given to understand that we are not going to let this Zionist group, this branch of the Communist movement, drag us into another world war to sacrifice 1,000,000 or 2,000,000 or probably 5,000,000 American boys.

Since the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] continues to insist on our following a policy which would probably lead us into a race war in Palestine and line up the whole Moslem world against us, I want to quote the words of a great American Jew, Mr. Benjamin H. Freedman, of New York, who bitterly opposes this entire movement for the partition of Palestine.

In a recent letter published by the National Economic Council, Inc., of New York, Mr. Freedman said, in part:

GENTLEMEN: I write you with respect to the so-called Palestine question.

The threat of political Zionism to the welfare and security of America is little realized. It is a dangerous mistake to think of it as a localized, Arab-Jewish struggle. There may

soon take place in Palestine an explosion that will set off another world war. Every American citizen, every head of a family, all members of Christian churches, every non-Zionist Jew, should be brought to understand that the consequences can be fatally disastrous.

It has always been a cardinal principle of American policy that all civilized peoples have a right to enjoy their own freedom. Limitation of immigration into any country by those who already live there is one of the basic rights belonging to any people. No self-respecting people will hesitate to resist forced immigration of aliens into their borders. The United States would never permit Soviet Russia to compel us to admit Japanese immigrants and to give them the choicest parts of the Pacific coast.

The slavery question resulted in the American Civil War. But such a question will be dwarfed by comparison with the issue whether Americans of the Christian faith should be sent to Moslem lands for the purpose of forcing upon the unwilling inhabitants the establishment of a national Jewish state. What if in such a war the newspapers of the United States begin printing casualty lists of American soldiers, Christians killed in Palestine to satisfy Zionist aspirations? Has anybody had sufficient foresight to understand what this may mean to the Jews of America, Zionist and non-Zionist alike? Doubtless the Jews in Palestine would be massacred to the last man, woman, and child.

But what of the Jews in America? Americans do not want another world war; if another should come in which the cause could be laid at the door of the Jew, who knows how popular resentment might break out against a whole people? Have the political Zionists stopped to consider that? Anti-Semitism is bad enough already in America. But if Zionists should push us into war for a Jewish Palestine, what will come will be to the present anti-Jewish sentiment as a hurricane is to a zephyr. If the majority non-Zionist Jews could only be brought to realize the disaster political Zionism is preparing for all Jews, and if they had the courage to act, they could break its power in a week. But they will not do this because they are afraid of being branded as "anti-Semitic Jews."

Popular ignorance of the real basis of political Zionism is beyond calculation. Vaguely most Christian Americans have the idea that the Jews claim Palestine because it was the Promised Land in which they lived for a period of a few centuries that ended 2,000 years ago. And the thought of a people returning to its homeland seems emotionally satisfying and good.

But here are facts most Americans do not know:

Political Zionism is almost exclusively a movement by the Jews of Europe. But these eastern European Jews have neither a racial nor a historic connection with Palestine. Their ancestors were not inhabitants of the Promised Land. They are the direct descendants of the people of the Khazar Kingdom, which existed until the twelfth century.

The Khazars were a non-Semitic, Turkic-Finn, Mongolian tribal people who, about the first century A. D., emigrated from middle Asia to eastern Europe. There they created one of the largest kingdoms of their time. At its greatest extent it covered an area of about 800,000 square miles. About the seventh century A. D., the King of the Khazars adopted Judaism as the state religion, and the majority of inhabitants joined him in the new allegiance. Before that date there was no such thing as a Khazar who was a Jew. Neither then nor since was there such a thing as a Khazar whose ancestors had come from the Holy Land. The Semitic peo-

ple, who established Judaism in Palestine many centuries before the Khazars became converts to the Hebrew faith, did mostly emigrate from Palestine. But none of them emigrated to the Khazar Kingdom far to the north.

• • • These eastern European, Yiddish-speaking Jews have no historic or racial connection with Palestine, or, for that matter, with the other Jews who existed in other countries for thousands of years prior to the Khazar conversion.

At best, the cry of truly Palestinian-descended Jews for a return of the homeland would be highly dubious. What right have peoples whose ancestors departed nearly 2,000 years ago to claim territory in which the present inhabitants have lived for 1,300 years? If the Indians should demand America back, would we all pack up and return to the lands of our ancestral origins? Yet the Arabs have been in Palestine 1,000 years longer than we have been here. And if the claim of Palestinian-descended Jews is so dubious, what of the claim of Khazar-descended Jews? Would a single Christian support their trek back to the homeland or want to oblige them by expelling the Arabs, if it were known that these eastern European, Yiddish-speaking Jews, who form the Zionist group practically in toto, have neither a geographic, historic, nor ethnic connection with either the Jews of the Old Testament or the land known today as Palestine?

If the Jewish claim to Palestine is stated on the only other remaining ground, the religious, it may be summarily and finally replied that religiously both Christians and Moslems also have religious roots there. The reason it is called the Holy Land today is because Jesus of Nazareth lived and died there. To Christians he is the Son of God and Saviour. To Mohammedans he is a great prophet. To official Jewry, he is an executed blasphemer.

The ability of Zionists to have things their way stems from the organized pressure they can bring upon people who do not agree with them. By holding the threat of being called anti-Semitic over men engaged in public or business life, they have been able to stifle opposition—even among American Jews such as the writer, who have no interest in forming a Jewish state and wish only to live and die as good Americans.

It will take courage for Americans of whatever origin to think these facts through and take public positions upon them. They will be smeared. They will be slandered. Already Zionists have been able to bring about the economic ruin of many Christians and Jews who have dared challenge their right to claim Palestine for a national Jewish state.

But America and American Christianity stand at a crossroad. The majority must decide whether it will longer submit to being the tool of a small but ruthless and unscrupulous minority of a minority people. The great majority of American Jews also must choose. Will we all acquiesce in the program of political Zionism? Will we follow it out to its inescapable consequences?

If we do, we shall be walking the road to ruin.

Sincerely yours,  
BENJAMIN H. FREEDMAN.  
PALESTINE

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi as usual speaks from a wealth of lack of information on the subject. There is no intention to set up in Palestine or in the Middle East

a theocratic government. The Jewish state in Palestine is not to be a religious state, and if he would read—and he who runs may read—he will readily perceive that there is not any idea of setting up a theocracy by the Jews in Palestine.

Beyond that he makes an aspersion upon those who, with great intrepidity and great wisdom, pioneered to set up that state, that they are inclined to be Communists or are Communists. That is a damnable statement to make.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that those words be taken down.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman from New York will take his seat.

The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

By Mr. CELLER. That is a damnable statement to make.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi objects to the word "damnable"; is that it?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; as used, it is a violation of the rules of the House and of all rules of common decency.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard?

The SPEAKER. This is not debatable. The Chair will pass on the question.

The Chair is not too conversant with the word "damnable" but does not find that it is banned in the rules of parliamentary procedure. The Chair thinks it is a rather harsh word.

The Chair hopes that the Members will not take this as a precedent for using the word on too many occasions.

Mr. CELLER. May I continue, Mr. Speaker? My 1 minute had not expired.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's 1 minute had already expired.

Mr. CELLER. Under leave to extend, I emphatically deny that the Palestine Jews are Communists. They abominate communism. Many of those who made the trek to Palestine did so to avoid and to escape communism. There is and will be in the proposed Jewish state uttermost freedom of religion. Examine the reports of its suggested constitution. In the main it is patterned after our own Constitution. It would enshroud the nationals of Palestine, Jews and Arabs alike, with the precious gift of our Bill of Rights—with freedom of speech, press, religion, peaceful assembly, with trial by jury, confrontation of witness for anyone accused, the right of petition, and the writ of habeas corpus. All these rights are foreign to communism and would hardly be found in Russia. The Jews in Palestine will set up a republic where, like our own, private capital and private initiative and enterprise will prevail.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FEIGHAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include a letter.

#### AMENDMENT TO ARTICLES OF WAR

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the

Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2575) to amend the Articles of War to improve the administration of military justice, to provide for more effective appellate review, to insure the equalization of sentences, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2575, amending the Articles of War, with Mr. CANFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULTON: On page 19, line 2, after the period insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"(d) There shall be strict equality of treatment in the confinement of officers and enlisted personnel awaiting trial and in the sentence, confinement, and punishment after sentence. No privileges or exemption from punishment or routine shall be granted to officers under confinement that are not granted equally to enlisted men under confinement."

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to be placed in the bill on page 19 at line 2. The purpose of the amendment is to make sure that under the military law of the United States governing the Army there shall be no possible variation from equal treatment as between officers and men. This amendment is so drawn that when they are confined prior to trial they shall be treated equally, that in the sentencing they shall be treated equally, and that in the confinement after trial they shall be treated equally.

You ask me whether I feel this is necessary under the law; and my answer is that I have seen it otherwise. I have visited Army camps in Europe where men were awaiting trial. In one of the camps I found three officers who were quartered in a very nice tent, a large tent, with a bed for each officer and as many blankets as he wanted, and a separate desk for each officer. They also had a fine floor under them. Then I went over and looked at the enlisted men who were confined there awaiting trial. I found that they had no shelter during the day and that at night they had but a pup tent for two men. I found further that they had no beds. They were required to sleep on a hard wooden floor. I found further that the hard wooden floor was of boards that the boards had curled so that I could put my hand between the boards, my whole four fingers. I talked with these enlisted men and asked them whether they had enough covers. This was in Italy in the fall. They said that they had only two blankets each and that they were cold. That was not the case with the officers.

If special privilege is to be given to officers I think the public wants the law so changed that the practice shall be stopped. It was not the case of just one officer but it has been the case with many, many officers.